



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/597,196	06/20/2000	John Zimmerman	US000127	6011
24737	7590	10/19/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			BAUGH, APRIL L	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2141	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/597,196	ZIMMERMAN, JOHN
Examiner	Art Unit	
April L Baugh	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5,7,9,10 and 12-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 5,7,9,10 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant has canceled claim 6 and 8, amended claims 7, 9, 10, and 13, therefore claims 5, 7, 9-10 and 12-16 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5, 9, and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 5 and 14-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Natsuno et al. (US 20002/0165773):

Regarding claim 5, AAPA teaches an appliance, comprising: a controller and a receiver connected thereto and effective to receive an ID device identifier (pg. 3, line 21-pg.4, line 3); a network interface; the controller being further programmed to access profile data on the profile server (pg.3, lines 8-11).

AAPA does not teach of a relay server. Natsuno et al. teaches a relay server corresponding to the ID device identifier; the controller being programmed to: transmit data responsive to the identifier to the relay server and receive a profile address in response from the relay server; the controller being further programmed to access data on the server (Fig. 7 and page 1, section 0011 and page 2, section 0014). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the personalization of smart appliances of AAPA by having a relay server because each appliance can be pre-programmed with the relay server location, independent of the location of the particular user's profile data and conversely the user's profile can be located anywhere independent of any particular appliance.

Referring to claims 14, AAPA teaches a method of controlling an appliance, comprising: receiving an address from a remote device, transmitting a request to the profile server, receiving a profile from the profile server, and controlling the appliance in dependence upon the profile.

AAPA does not teach of a relay server. Natsuno et al. teaches transmitting a first request to the relay server, receiving an address of a profile server from the relay server, transmitting a second request to the profile server, receiving a profile from the profile server (Fig. 7 and page 1, section 0011 and page 2, section 0014). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the personalization of smart appliances of AAPA by having a relay server because each appliance can be pre-programmed with the relay server location, independent of the location of the particular user's profile data and conversely the user's profile can be located anywhere independent of any particular appliance.

Referring to claim 16, AAPA teaches the method of claim 14, further including receiving an address from another remote device, transmitting a request to the other profile server, receiving another profile from the other profile server, and controlling the appliance in dependence upon the other profile.

AAPA does not teach of a relay server. Natsuno et al. teaches transmitting a third request to the other relay server, receiving an address of an other profile server from the other relay server, transmitting a fourth request to the other profile server, receiving an other profile from the other profile server (Fig. 7 and page 1, section 0011 and page 2, section 0014). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the personalization of smart appliances of AAPA by having a relay server because each appliance can be pre-preprogrammed with the relay server location, independent of the location of the particular user's profile data and conversely the user's profile can be located anywhere independent of any particular appliance.

Regarding claim 15, AAPA teaches the method of claim 14, wherein the remote device is a radio-frequency identification device (pg. 3, line 21 through pg. 4, line 3).

3. Claims 7, 9, 10, 12, and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Natsuno et al. (US 20002/0165773) as applied to claims 5, 14-16 above, and further in view of Killian (US 6,163,316).

Regarding claims 9, AAPA in view of Natsuno et al. teaches a method wherein: receiving at least the portion of the first configuration data includes receiving first relay data responsive to a network server identified in the first access data, receiving profile data made accessible via the network by the first relay data (pg. 3, line 5-11 and pg. 4, lines 4-11 of AAPA) and receiving at

least the portion of the second configuration data includes receiving second relay data responsive to a network server identified in the second access data, and receiving profile data made accessible via the network by the second relay data (Fig. 7 and page 1, section 0011 and page 2, section 0014 of Natsuno et al.).

AAPA in view of Natsuno et al. does not teach configuring the appliance responsively to the first configuration data and reconfiguring the appliance responsively to the second configuration data. Killian teaches controlling the operation of an appliance, comprising: receiving, at an appliance, first access data from a first remote device, the access data providing network access to first configuration data; receiving at the appliance at least a portion of the first configuration data via the network; configuring the appliance responsively to the first configuration data; receiving, at the appliance, second access data to the appliance from a second remote device, the second access data providing network access to second configuration data; receiving at the appliance at least a portion of the second configuration data; reconfiguring the appliance responsively to the second configuration data (column 2, lines 6-12 and column 9, lines 15-19 and column 10, lines 55-60). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the personalization of smart appliances of AAPA in view of Natsuno et al. by configuring the appliance responsively to the first configuration data and reconfiguring the appliance responsively to the second because this allows viewers that as a group are watching the television at the same time to be able to have the program guide and shows configured to please everyone watching.

Referring to claim 7, AAPA teaches a method as in claim 9, wherein each of the first remote device and the second remote device correspond to a portable device (pg. 3, line 5-11).

Referring to claim 10, AAPA teaches a method as in claim 9, wherein: each of the first and second remote devices corresponds to a radio frequency identification device (pg. 3, line 21 through pg. 4, line 3).

Referring to claim 12, AAPA teaches a method as in claim 10, wherein delivering the first and second access data includes co-locating the radio frequency identification device with the appliance (pg. 3, line 21 through pg. 4, line 3).

Regarding claim 13, AAPA teaches a method as in claim 9, wherein receiving at least the portion of the first configuration data includes receiving a portion of profile data including data relating to the appliance and data relating to another type of appliance (pg. 3, line 5-11 and pg. 4, lines 4-11).

Conclusion


4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to personalization of smart appliances in general: Allport, Herz et al., and Maissel et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 703-305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB



LE HIEN LUU
PATENT EXAMINER